Message

From: Strauss, Linda [Strauss.Linda@epa.gov]

Sent: 6/22/2017 9:36:56 PM

To: Pierce, Alison [Pierce.Alison@epa.gov]; Morris, Jeff [Morris.Jeff@epa.gov]; Beck, Nancy [Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]

CC: Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy [Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov]; Doa, Maria [Doa.Maria@epa.gov]

Subject: RE: ORD + OCSPP ACTION: ABC Darwin re: PFAS

great

From: Pierce, Alison

Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 5:36 PM

To: Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>; Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>

Cc: Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy <Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov>; Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: ORD + OCSPP ACTION: ABC Darwin re: PFAS

Just got some links from CCD. Will be sending your way shortly after I have a chance to clean up.

ALISON PIERCE

Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, DC 20460 USA

PIERCE.ALISON@EPA.GOV

202.564.2437

From: Strauss, Linda

Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 5:36 PM

To: Morris, Jeff < Morris.Jeff@epa.gov >; Beck, Nancy < Beck.Nancy@epa.gov >

Cc: Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy < Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov >; Pierce, Alison < Pierce.Alison@epa.gov >; Doa, Maria

<Doa.Maria@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: ORD + OCSPP ACTION: ABC Darwin re: PFAS

Any word on this?

From: Morris, Jeff

Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 12:58 PM **To:** Beck, Nancy < <u>Beck.Nancy@epa.gov</u>>

Cc: Strauss, Linda <<u>Strauss.Linda@epa.gov</u>>; Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy <<u>Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov</u>>; Pierce,

Alison < Pierce. Alison@epa.gov >; Doa, Maria < Doa. Maria@epa.gov >

Subject: Re: ORD + OCSPP ACTION: ABC Darwin re: PFAS

I'm copying Maria, as I believe we have made this recommendation previously but I don't know what's on the web or otherwise in the public domain.

Sent from my iPad

On Jun 22, 2017, at 12:53 PM, Beck, Nancy < Beck. Nancy@epa.gov > wrote:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Thanks.

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP

P: 202-564-1273

M: Personal Phone / Ex. 6 beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Strauss, Linda

Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 12:51 PM

To: Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy < Cleland-Hamnett. Wendy@epa.gov >; Beck, Nancy

<<u>Beck.Nancy@epa.gov</u>>; Morris, Jeff <<u>Morris.Jeff@epa.gov</u>>

Cc: Pierce, Alison < Pierce. Alison@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: ORD + OCSPP ACTION: ABC Darwin re: PFAS

#2 was assigned to OCSPP. OK to go?

1. How would you describe the link (if any) between PFAS and human health risks/disease?

[Previous OW response] EPA's health advisories are based on the best available peer-reviewed studies of the effects of PFOA and PFOS on laboratory animals (rats and mice) and were also informed by epidemiological studies of human populations that have been exposed to perfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs). These studies indicate that exposure to PFOA and PFOS over certain levels may result in adverse health effects, including developmental effects to fetuses during pregnancy or to breastfed infants (e.g., low birth weight, accelerated puberty, skeletal variations), cancer (e.g., testicular, kidney), liver effects (e.g., tissue damage), immune effects (e.g., antibody production and immunity), thyroid effects and other effects (e.g., cholesterol changes). To learn more about the underlying studies for the health advisories, see EPA's Health Effects Support Documents (U.S. EPA 2016) for PFOA and PFOS.

2. OSCPP lead: What are EPA recommendations around the continued use of PFAS chemicals in firefighting foam (for example at airports)

Aqueous film form foam (AFFF) that contain PFAS chemicals are typically used to extinguish highly flammable or combustible liquid Class B fires, such as fires involving gas tankers and oil refineries. The biggest users of AFFF are in the U.S. military, petrochemical, and aviation industries. While the majority of AFFF is being manufactured using primarily telomer-based short-chain PFAS substances, there is continued use of existing stocks of products which contain long-chain chemicals. In addition, a few companies continue to manufacture (including import) AFFF with long-chain PFAS chemicals.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Reporter: Nadia Daly

Outlet ABC Darwin (Australia)

DDL: 6/22, 3 p.m.

Request:

I am looking to build a complete, nuanced picture of how PFAS is understood in the international scientific community. Here are my questions

- 1. How would you describe the link (if any) between PFAS and human health risks/disease?
- 2. What are EPA recommendations around the continued use of PFAS chemicals in firefighting foam (for example at airports)
- 3. How are the Australian guidelines different to those of the US EPA and are the Australian guidelines comprehensive enough and considered sufficient by the international scientific community?

(http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/2200FE086D480353CA2580C9 00817CDC/\$File/fs-Health-Based-Guidance-

Values.pdf and http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/2200FE086D480 353CA2580C900817CDC/\$File/Consoldiated-report-perflourianted-chemicals-food.pdf

4. The Australian Department of Health states "There is currently no consistent evidence that exposure to PFOS and PFOA causes adverse human health effects."

(http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/content/A12B57E41EC9F326CA257BF 0001F9E7D/\$File/PFAS-guidance-statement-15June2016.pdf) However this appears to be a slightly different to what the EPA has found in its research. What is your view on that?